

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, and 15 are pending in this application, Claims 1 and 12 having been currently amended. Support for amended Claims 1 and 12 can be found, for example, in the original claims, drawings, and the specification as originally filed.¹ No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moteki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,243,645; hereinafter “Moteki”) in view of Schneider et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0192049; hereinafter “Schneider”).

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of Examiner Khatib for granting an interview with Applicants’ representative on September 16, 2010, during which time the issues in the outstanding Office Action were discussed as substantially summarized hereinafter and also on the Interview Summary sheet. During the interview, a proposed amendment was discussed in which Claim 1 would recite that “the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed along an entire lower edge and an upper edge of the display, respectively or the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed along the entire upper edge and the lower edge of the display.” Examiner Khatib indicated that this amendment would overcome the cited references. In light of the Examiner’s indication, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 12 to include the proposed amendments discussed with the Examiner during the interview.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moteki in view of Schneider, Applicants respectfully submit that amended

¹ See Figures 14 and 15.

independent Claims 1 and 12 recite novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Amended independent Claim 1 is directed to an apparatus configured to display at least a map relating to navigation, and video content from a plurality of sources including, *inter alia*:

...a display configured

to switch, when displaying said map, the display of said map to a display of video content, when a source operator for switching said sources is operated;

to sequentially and cyclically switch, when displaying said video content, between playback target sources of said plurality of sources, when said source operator is operated;

to switch, when displaying said video content, the display of said video content to the display of said map, when a map operator for instructing displaying of said map is operated; and

to switch, when displaying said map, the display of said map to the display of said video content, when said map operator is operated,

wherein ***a first display bar is displayed on the display and includes information about said map and a second display bar is displayed on the display and includes information about said video content, and***

the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed along an entire lower edge and an upper edge of the display, respectively or the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed along the entire upper edge and the lower edge of the display, respectively; and

a setting unit configured to set one of a plurality of sizes of a region for displaying said map or one of a plurality of sizes of a region for displaying said video content in a dual screen display, and to accept a size from said plurality of sizes of the region for displaying said video content for each of said sources,

wherein the display is configured to form said dual screen display based on a setting corresponding to each source.

Amended independent Claim 12 recites substantially similar features as independent Claim 1. Thus, the arguments presented below with respect to independent Claim 1 are also applicable to independent Claim 12.

As acknowledged at page 4 of the outstanding Office Action, Moteki fails to explicitly disclose “a first display bar is displayed on the display and includes information about said map and a second display bar is displayed on the display and includes information about said video content” and “the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed at a lower edge and an upper edge of the display, respectively or the first display bar and the second display bar are displayed at the upper edge and the lower edge of the display, respectively.” In an attempt to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Moteki, pages 4 and 5 of the outstanding Office Action cites paragraphs [0042], [0062], and [0067] of Schneider.

Applicants respectfully submit that Schneider fails to teach or suggest “the first display bar and the second display bar are ***displayed along an entire lower edge and an upper edge*** of the display, respectively or the first display bar and the second display bar are ***displayed along the entire upper edge and the lower edge*** of the display, respectively,” as recited in Claim 1. As described during the interview, Figure 1 of Schneider shows a control bar 190, but the control bar 190 is not displayed along an entire lower edge, as the control bar 190 does not extend all the way across the display screen in Figure 1. That is, there is space between the end of the control bar and the edge of the screen shown in Figure 1. Figure 9 of Schneider shows possible layouts of the content channels, but clearly does not show a control bar displayed along an entire lower or upper edge of the display.

During the interview, the Examiner asserted that the supplementary channels 170 and 180 are being interpreted as Applicants’ second display bar. However, as acknowledged by the Examiner during the interview, the supplementary channels 170 and 180 are not described as being displayed along an entire lower or upper edge of the display.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1 and 12 (and all claims depending thereon) patentably distinguishes over Moteki in view of Schneider.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moteki in view of Schneider be withdrawn.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, and in light of the above discussion, the pending claims as presented herewith are believed to be in condition for formal allowance, and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 03/06)

Derek Benke
Registration No. 56,944